



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

02/27/94 142,000,000 XING

6 2616-US/RIP

1402/0324

EXAMINER

PATENT COUNSEL
APPLIED MATERIALS INC.
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 4504
SANTA CLARA CA 95050

7ERV160N1.R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED:

03/20/94

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No
09/298,064

Applicant(s)

Xing et al

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit

1763



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 22, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 8-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, and 17-20 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17 2(a))

*Certified copies not received _____

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, 17-20, drawn to a remote plasma processing apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 723MW
 - II. Claims 8-16, drawn to a method for forming a remote plasma processing apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 723MW
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: **Inventions** I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus whereby the different apparatus is not limited to the apparatus characteristics claimed.
3. During a telephone conversation between Marianne L. Padgett and Michael Bernadicou (408.720.8300) on November 12, 1999 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-7, 17-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-16 of group II withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1763

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by P. J. Matsuo et al¹. P. J. Matsuo et al identically describe a plasma semiconductor processing apparatus that generates a microwave plasma remotely relative to the substrate's location (Section I, Introduction; Figure 1). Additionally, the variable length of the plasma delivery tube is assessed under numerous conditions such as etch rates (Section III A.2, p.1803), reaction layer thickness (Section III C.4, p.1809), atomic (neutral) and reactive (radical) species concentration (Section IV.B, p.1812).

¹J.Vac.Sci.Technol. A 15(4), Jul/Aug 1997

Art Unit: 1763

7. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mehrdad M. Moslehi (U.S. Pat. 5,082,517). Mehrdad M. Moslehi identically describe a plasma semiconductor processing apparatus that generates a microwave plasma remotely relative to the substrate's location (column 1, lines 5-15). The control of the composition of neutral and reactive species, and its importance to plasma processing, is taught by Mehrdad M. Moslehi (column 1, lines 46-68, column 2, lines 37-42, column 4, lines 9-14; column 12, lines 56-68)

Claim Objections

8. Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The recitation of intended use is known by the office as failing to further limit:

MPEP 2106

(I) Intended Use or Field of Use Statements

Claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim, particularly when only presented in the claim preamble. Thus, Office personnel should be careful to properly interpret such language. *Walter*, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409 (Because none of the claimed steps were explicitly or implicitly limited to their application in seismic prospecting activities, the court held that "[a]lthough the claim preambles relate

Art Unit: 1763

the claimed invention to the art of seismic prospecting, the claims themselves are not drawn to methods of or apparatus for seismic prospecting, they are drawn to improved mathematical methods for interpreting the results of seismic prospecting." Cf. Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1558. When such language is treated as nonlimiting, Office personnel should expressly identify in the Office action the claim language that constitutes the intended use or field of use statements and provide the basis for their findings. This will shift the burden to applicant to demonstrate why the language is to be treated as a claim limitation.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. 6,029,602

The following references were requested of ILL via the PTO STIC resources:

J.Appl.Phys. **74**, 1349 (1993)

J.Appl.Phys. **15**(1976)

Appl.Phys.Lett. **52**, 1170 (1988)

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (703) 305-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/298,064

Page 6

Art Unit: 1763

The official AF fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 305-3599. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (703) 308-0661. If the examiner can not be reached and specific inquiry on the merits of the cases's prosecution is desired then contact the examiner's supervisor Marian Knode at (703) 308-4311.

